THE PROPOSED IOWA JUVENILE COURT INTAKE RISK ASSESSMENT

Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Statistical Analysis Center

Richard G. Moore, Administrator

Principal Researchers & Authors:

David Huff, Justice Systems Analyst
Lettie Prell, Justice Systems Analyst

Technical Assistance & Support:

Bryn Gillis, Administrative Intern

The funding for this project was supported under award #93-IJ-CX-K019 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this report are those of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Statistical Analysis Center and do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the Department of Human Rights, the Iowa Chief Juvenile Court Officers, or the U.S. Department of Justice.

OVERVIEW

The Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) received a new mandate through the passage of House Files 2452 during the 1992 session of the Iowa General Assembly to identify and evaluate juvenile delinquency treatment programs through its advisory council's multi-year planning and reporting process. CJJP was also authorized to begin coordinating the development of a multi-agency database to track the progress of juveniles through various state and local agencies and programs, to evaluate the experiences of juveniles and the success of the services provided to them, and to facilitate the sharing of case management information among system officials and agencies.

In working to comply with these mandates, CJJP and key players in Iowa's juvenile justice system identified an obstacle to statewide planning and evaluation of juvenile services delivery and program impact -- a lack of common identifiers with which to uniformly classify juveniles at-risk of recidivism across the state. Without a classification system for juvenile delinquents, evaluators run the risk of drawing inappropriate conclusions about an individual program's success (or failure). Program success might be attributed either to dealing with low risk adolescents or to successful service delivery with high risk adolescents. In either case, it is necessary to examine what makes programs successful. Through the use of juvenile risk assessments, evaluators can control for client risk when examining outcome information, which not only leads to a more informed analysis, but may be used to assist in determining what programs and interventions work for particular groups of at-risk youth, and enable comparisons between programs, even those that may lie in different areas of the state.

About the same time that CJJP received its new mandates with regards to the study of juvenile delinquents and services, the Governor of Iowa recommended that CJJP work with the courts to develop assessment criteria to be used as a tool in selecting juvenile dispositions. It was anticipated that the implementation of such a tool would provide greater validity, structure, and consistency to the assessment and decision making processes. It was also anticipated that formal assessment criteria would allow for a more efficient distribution of resources by directing the most intensive and intrusive interventions to the most serious, violent, and chronic offenders.

A work group comprised of Iowa's eight Chief Juvenile Court Officers (JCOs) was formed to assist with the strategic planning of the risk assessment project. This group explored a variety of issues including: the type of tool that would be the most useful to line staff (needs assessment or risk assessment); at what point in the system such a tool would be most useful (e.g. intake, predisposition, etc.); how to construct such a tool (utilizing an existing tool versus creating an Iowa-specific tool) and other related issues.

RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT CREATION

Examination of Existing Tools

The Chief JCOs along with CJJP staff identified the need to begin the project by examining existing assessment tools as well as the need to examine the issues associated with case processing and other relevant juvenile justice practices in the state of Iowa. One of the ideas briefly explored by CJJP staff was to utilize one of the two existing tools designed for use with Iowa's adult offenders. As such, CJJP staff examined the Iowa Department of Corrections' instrument which was developed and implemented to identify the appropriate level of supervision for adult probationers and parolees; and, the Iowa Board of Parole's risk assessment tool designed to ascertain a prisoner's suitability for release. After examining these tools in regards to their applicability to juvenile delinquents it was decided by both the Chief JCOs and CJJP staff that this was not a viable option. The primary reason this option was not chosen was the Chief JCO's decision to construct an instrument with the involvement of juvenile court officers and to include factors that were empirically validated to be predictors of juvenile recidivism in other jurisdictions.

In making the decision not to utilize one of the existing adult tools, CJJP and the Chief's drew upon Colorado's experience with using an assessment tool designed for both juveniles and adults. In July of 1990, the Colorado Division of Youth Services Task Force released a report that questioned Colorado's risk assessment instrument in regards to its applicability to juveniles. The report suggested that such an instrument was not accurately predicting juvenile recidivism and in order to correct the problem the authors of the report suggested that juvenile-specific risk items needed to be included. In following the recommendations of the report, the Colorado Division of Youth Services has recently entered into a contract with the University of Colorado to come up with a new tool to be used state-wide by the Judicial Department to make placement decisions for juveniles. It is hoped by Colorado officials that the new tool will more appropriately reflect the risk and needs of juveniles.

As a result of the Chief's decision, CJJP turned its efforts to the examination of juvenile-specific assessment instruments in regards to their applicability for use in jurisdictions other than those in which the tool was originally designed. The U.S. Department of Justice (1995) conducted an examination of eight different risk tools in which they identified a core set of variables (age at first arrest, peers, substance abuse, school functioning, family functioning, number of priors) that appear repeatedly on validated scales. However, it was found that some items increase the prediction or classification power of the tools in some jurisdictions but not in others. This finding suggests that there are site specific factors that influence either recidivism or the measurement of it. Therefore, an instrument developed for one site may not be transferable to another jurisdiction without first being validated by the adopting agency.

The results from these examination efforts were presented to the Chief JCOs during a meeting to discuss the direction of this project. Two of the primary issues discussed during this meeting

included the type of instrument desired (a needs or a risk assessment instrument), and where in the juvenile justice system such a tool would be of greatest benefit. **As a group, the Chief JCOs decided that it would be most beneficial to develop and implement a risk assessment instrument for use during the intake phase of delinquency processing.**

Once the decision regarding the type of assessment tool was made, CJJP incorporated a number of procedures in identifying the best predictors of recidivism. These procedures included: examining relevant juvenile justice practices; developing a test instrument; collecting case-specific data at intake; developing a follow-up instrument; collecting follow-up data; and, analyzing the data.

Examination of Relevant Juvenile Justice Practices

The Chief JCOs and CJJP decided that one of the first steps in constructing a risk assessment instrument would be to examine case processing and related issues and how they are similar or different across the state. To this end, CJJP staff conducted surveys, interviews and visited several juvenile court offices. Two different surveys regarding case processing issues were sent to each of the Chief JCOs. In the first survey, the Chief JCOs were asked to respond to a question regarding the length of time it takes to process a juvenile delinquent through the following phases: intake; informal adjustment; pre-disposition; and dispositional review.

In regards to the intake interview the general consensus is that the interview itself, for basic information, takes place within an hour or so. However, the entire intake process may range from two to four weeks. Decisions regarding informal adjustments are often made at the time of the intake interview. Three of the Chiefs indicated that a pre-disposition interview often takes several hours to complete, while four stated that it takes from two to six weeks, and one had no comment. Depending on where the juvenile is placed, a dispositional review may occur for administrative purposes between three and six months. Actual court reviews occur at six and twelve months, while informal checks and reviews may occur as necessary. The findings from this survey provided CJJP with valuable information of each judicial district's practices and further underscored the need for a state-wide risk assessment instrument that was designed to account for case processing differences.

A second survey of the Chiefs was conducted to provide CJJP with further information regarding juvenile court practices. One of the questions asked how much time it takes, on average, between an intake interview and a dispositional hearing. Four of the eight districts indicated that typically it takes two weeks for a dispositional hearing to be held, two stated that it takes about a month, one said it could take between three and four months and another chief indicated that it may take even longer. Another item asked how long it took between receiving a referral and getting the information in the case record. All of the Chiefs responded that it would occur within a one week period.

In order to further study case processing differences and record keeping issues, CJJP conducted site visits to various offices. These site visits allowed CJJP to meet with intake officers and

review selected case records which provided CJJP with valuable information as well as an opportunity to develop a relationship with line staff who would ultimately be responsible for the implementation of such a tool. Not all of the feedback CJJP received during these visits was positive. There was some resistance, primarily from long-time veterans, to developing a risk assessment tool, who questioned its purpose and how it would be implemented. However, such resistance was not pervasive and these face-to-face exchanges seemed to help allay some of the concerns.

RISK ASSESSMENT ITEM SELECTION

Even though we did not adopt another jurisdictions' risk assessment tool, individual items from those tools were compiled into working documents for discussionary purposes in selecting what items the JCOs felt were most appropriate for measuring risk of recidivism. The core set of validated predictive factors discussed above along with input from the juvenile court line staff were utilized in the design of the risk assessment tool. A risk assessment design session with JCOs representing each of the eight judicial districts was conducted at the State Capitol in Des Moines, Iowa. Following the introduction, small groups were formed to identify the major segments of a potential risk assessment instrument. This exercise resulted in the identification of broad subject areas which were utilized to guide item construction. These areas included current and prior offense information, service treatment history, substance abuse history, school information, emotional issues, abuse issues, runaway history, peer relationships, and parenting issues. Items were then prioritized and refined for inclusion in a preliminary draft of the data collection instrument which was used as a discussion tool for design purposes.

Following the creation of the data collection instrument, a set of guidelines and preliminary instructions were developed and presented to juvenile court personnel via the Iowa Communication Network (ICN). The individuals who participated in the ICN training were designated by their Chief JCOs to serve as a team facilitators to provide the necessary instructions regarding the completion of the data collection instrument to other juvenile court staff in their judicial district. During this training session, JCOs provided CJJP with valuable input regarding the data collection instrument and other related issues.

THE RISK ASSESSMENT DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

The risk assessment data collection instrument was implemented state-wide between October and November of 1994 (see Attachment A). At the end of each week, the completed data collection instruments were sent to CJJP. In cases in which information was missing or difficult to read, CJJP staff worked with the officers to correct it. Offices within three of the judicial districts de-identified the risk assessment data which means that code numbers were listed on the instruments sent to CJJP in lieu of juvenile's names, and a list of the code numbers along with the corresponding names was kept at the district offices.

FOLLOW-UP DATA COLLECTION

CJJP and the Chief JCOs decided that the follow-up data collection efforts would occur eight months after the original data collection. The purpose of the follow-up was to gather data regarding re-offending. Through conversations with each of the Chiefs, it was decided that due to limited resources, the JCOs and their staff would collect the follow-up information for CJJP. One of the districts was able to utilize the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS) to provide information regarding re-offending. CJJP went through a similar developmental process in creating the follow-up instrument as it did when it created the data collection instrument; planning meetings were held, JCOs provided input, and the instrument was tested (see Attachment B).

Risk Assessment Test Sample

A total of 1,242 risk assessments were completed during the test period. It is difficult, however, to know what portion of the total juvenile court intakes this number represents since Iowa does not systematically collect such information. The closest Iowa could empirically get to identifying the "true number" of juvenile court intakes was by reviewing data collected and maintained by the State Court Administrator's office regarding the number and type of juvenile petitions filed in a given year. Because a petition is filed on only some of the youth who complete the intake process, CJJP had to rely on an estimate made by the Chief JCOs. The Chiefs estimated that approximately 1,300 intakes were completed during a typical month.

Even though the "true number" of intakes was unknown, there was sufficient reason, given the state-wide implementation and monitoring of the instrument, to believe that the 1,242 risk assessments were representative of intakes in a one month period. Some problems occurred during the follow-up data collection period which lowered the number of useable cases from 1,242 to 1,173. The problems that occurred were largely associated with those jurisdictions that chose to use de-identifying codes; this was a problem in two different judicial districts because it became difficult to correctly identify the cases during the follow-up data collection process. Another problem in one of the offices was that the cases were not intake cases (youth already under jurisdiction, youth waived to adult court, case reviews, etc.), as a result, cases from this office were deleted from the analysis. Neither of these problems were considered a major obstacle to data collection since CJJP was still able to obtain a completion rate of 94%.

Background Characteristics Of The Test Sample

Of these 1,173 cases, there were 17 juveniles who received more than one intake during the study implementation period. There were 294 cases in which a juvenile re-offended during the eight month follow-up period, resulting in a recidivism rate of 25% for the study sample. The majority of the youth were males, 15 years of age or older, white, and had committed a non-violent misdemeanor offense such as theft.

Seventy-seven percent of the juveniles were male, 22% were female, and the sex of five was unknown. Age at the time of the intake interview ranged from 6 to 17 for the non-recidivists and 8 to 17 for the recidivists (see Table 1). The non-recidivist group of juveniles included one 6 year old and five 7 year olds, while the youngest juvenile who recidivated was at least 8 years of age.

TABLE 1: AGE AT INTAKE

AGE	RECIDIVISTS		NON-RECIDIVISTS		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
6-10 years	8	14	49	86	57	100
11-12 years	42	37	73	63	115	100
13-14 years	61	23	206	77	267	100
15-16 years	128	29	306	71	434	100
17 years	55	18	245	82	300	100

Note: percentage may not add to 100% due to rounding.

The recidivist group includes slightly fewer Whites, but more Blacks and Hispanics than the non-recidivist group (see Table 2). There were slightly more felonies against persons and non-persons among the recidivists than the non-recidivists (see Table 3).

TABLE 2: RACE AND ETHNICITY

RACE	RECIDIVISTS		NON-RECIDIVISTS		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
White	234	23	766	77	1000	100
Black	37	39	59	61	96	100
Asian/Pacific Islanders	1	14	6	86	7	100
Native American	1	10	9	90	10	100
Hispanic	12	41	17	59	29	100
Other	2	67	1	33	3	100
Unknown	7	25	21	75	28	100

Note: percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 3: OFFENSE SEVERITY

TYPE OF OFFENSE	RECIDIVISTS		NON-RECIDIVISTS		TOTAL	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Felony, person	11	85	2	15	13	100
Felony, non-person	48	29	117	71	165	100
Misdemeanor, person	54	24	171	76	225	100
Misdemeanor, non-person	181	24	568	76	749	100

Note: percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

The Proposed Risk Assessment Instrument

In order to identify the items for inclusion in the proposed risk assessment instrument, CJJP utilized both bivariate (e.g., frequencies, crosstabulations, Pearson's correlation coefficients) and multivariate (logistic regression) statistical procedures. Logistical regression allows the researcher to examine the relationship between several independent variables (e.g., number of school suspensions, drug use, etc.) and a dependent variable (e.g., recidivism) simultaneously.

Once the significant risk assessment items were identified, various test instruments and scoring schemes were devised . Risk categories were created by examining recidivism rates of individual risk scores. The test instruments were then analyzed for effectiveness utilizing mean cost rating (MCR). The MCR statistic allows a researcher to assess the effectiveness of a risk assessment instrument by weighting the costs of assessing cases incorrectly at each risk level with the benefits of assessing risk correctly at each risk level in regards to a third factor, in this case, re-referral for an additional offense (Berkson, 1947).

MCR scores vary from 0.00 to 1.00; a score of zero indicates that there is no prediction of recidivism, and a score of 1.00 indicates a perfect prediction. MCR is often interpreted as the proportional improvement over chance in the predictive efficiency of the device in question. As Fischer (1985) pointed out an assessment of this type should achieve a MCR score of at least .350 to significantly improve on existing clinical judgments. The MCR score for Iowa's proposed juvenile risk assessment instrument is .362 which is similar to the Fischer guideline.[1]

The proposed risk assessment instrument contains five risk categories with descriptive labels indicating whether the recidivism rate for the category is higher or lower than the base recidivism rate of 25%. An important feature of the proposed risk assessment instrument is that none of the categories have a recidivism rate equal to the base rate and therefore provides the greatest utility in identifying at risk youths who are clearly more at risk than others. While many risk assessments in other jurisdictions only contain three risk categories (high, medium, and low), the proposed five category assessment is considered to be more helpful to JCOs in identifying recidivism. The goal of this research was to avoid the creation of a risk category that was the same as the base recidivism rate.

As Fischer (1983) stated, the goals of a risk assessment tool is to accurately assess high-risk offenders in order to provide the appropriate intervention. The findings for this instrument show that 71% of those juveniles at the highest level of risk were re-referred for an additional offense, while only 13% of those categorized as low risk reoffended. The statistics for the highest risk level needs to be viewed with caution given the low number of youth in this category. CJJP chose not to combine the two highest risk categories (high and very high) to identify the most serious

[1] The gamma statistic which is a similar measure of the relationship between an independent variable and the dependent variable was also employed. The gamma statistic for these data were found to be .466 which is also statistically significant at the .01 level and is comparable to or better than scores found in may adult and juvenile risk assessments in other jurisdictions (Hagan, 1989).

risk levels and to provide comparable data for future research efforts that focus on the later stages of juvenile court case processing.

The proposed risk assessment instrument includes six risk items, four selected demographic variables (see Attachment C), and the scoring matrix. By completing the four items in Step 1, it can be readily determined if the juvenile is low risk. In Step 2, the risk level for all other juveniles becomes apparent when further items are completed and a scoring matrix is consulted which indicates the risk level that most accurately describes the youth. Using data collected, CJJP created a scoring matrix independent of the JCOs treatment decisions.

Two control variables, race and gender, were examined with regards to equity issues and how they influence the prediction of risk. It can be concluded from the findings that the proposed Iowa Juvenile Court risk assessment instrument does not discriminate on the basis of race. Recidivism rates of the various non-white racial and ethnic groups do not as a whole indicate that such youth are being incorrectly scored higher than they actually should be (see Attachment D). However, some of the race categories had too few cases to draw meaningful conclusions.

During the analysis, a number of alternative risk assessments were explored before one was identified which appeared to achieve maximum predictive efficiency. In analyzing its predictive value with regard to sex it was discovered that girls in the medium low, medium high and high risk categories were being over assessed; that is, girls recidivism rates in these groups were lower than those of boys (see Tables 4 & 5). An adjustment for sex was therefore indicated, for two reasons. First, it would ensure gender equity in selecting appropriate dispositions for youth based on objective risk criteria. This adjustment would ensure that girls and boys would receive similar dispositions based on their risk; otherwise some girls would have received more serious dispositions. Second, such an adjustment would improve the predictive validity of the entire risk assessment instrument.

Many risk assessments developed in other jurisdictions for both youth and adults include sex as a risk assessment item. That is, males are scored a point or two for being male, and/or females are assessed zero points or some negative number. An early iteration of the proposed instrument that provided for such scoring showed that gender equity had not been satisfactorily accomplished. Moreover, it was found that special problems with regard to the scoring of boys had been introduced. It was found that some boys in the middle group were being "bumped" up to higher level inappropriately. Subsequent iterations of the instrument found that a common scoring system, but separate scaling for boys and girls, best achieved gender equity as well as overall improvement of the assessment's predictive efficiency.

TABLE 4: PROPOSED RISK CATEGORIES BY SEX
(with and without adjustment for sex)

	No Adjustment For Sex			With Adjustment For Sex		
	Total Cases	Non-Recidivists	Recidivism Rate	Total Cases	Non-Recidivists	Recidivism Rate
Risk Category	n	n	%	n	n	%
Low	387	336	13%	387	336	13%
Medium Low	235	198	16%	299	249	17%
Medium High	353	237	33%	302	195	35%
High	184	104	44%	171	95	44%
Very High	14	4	71%	14	4	71%
TOTAL	**1,173**	**879**	**25%**	**1,173**	**879**	**25%**
MCR		.354			.364	

TABLE 5: PROPOSED RISK CATEGORIES AND RECIDIVISM RATES BY SEX

	BOYS		GIRLS		COMBINED	
Risk Category	n	%	n	%	n	%
Low	280	14%	107	10%	387	13%
Medium Low	170	17%	129	17%	299	17%
Medium High	289	36%	13	31%	302	35%
High	163	45%	8	38%	171	44%
Very High	12	67%	2	100%	14	71%
TOTAL	**914**	**28%**	**259**	**16%**	**1173**	**25%**
MCR	.348		.256		.364	

CONCLUSION

To address Iowa's current inability to classify those juveniles at-risk of recidivism uniformity across the state, a juvenile risk assessment instrument was created by CJJP in conjunction with the Chief JCOs and their line staff. Through a multifaceted process, a juvenile risk assessment was created and validated for use at the intake phase of juvenile court processing. The proposed tool includes four demographic variables, six risk items, and a five level scoring matrix.

It was anticipated that the risk assessment instrument would be useful in not only providing the JCOs with a tool to appropriately assess the risk of recidivism, but also in providing "common ground" to treatment staff and other relevant officials to examine issues such as; whether certain interventions work better with certain levels of risk than others, and whether limited resources are being appropriately utilized in providing appropriate intervention to juveniles with specific risk scores.

REFERENCES

Berkson, J., "Cost Utility as a Measure of Efficiency of a Test," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **42** (1947), 246-255.

Fischer, D., "Better Public Protection with Fewer Inmates?" *Corrections Today*, (December, 1983), 16-20.

-----, *Prediction and Incapacitation: Issues and Answers (An Overview of the Iowa Research on Recidivism and Violence Prediction)*, Iowa Statistical Analysis Center Office for Planning and Programming, 1985.

Hagan, F. E., *Research Methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology (2nd edition)*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.

Attachment A

RISK ASSESSMENT TEST INSTRUMENT

Worker_____ County_____

District____ Date of Interview____/____/____ Client Name_____

Date of Birth_____/_____/_____Sex_____Race_____ Crime(s) _____

_____

1. Current Offense Type (check one): Crime Against Persons [ ] Crimes Not Against Persons [ ]

2. Number of Current Offense(s) (indicate number of each): Felony_____ Aggravated Misdemeanor_____ Serious Misdemeanor_____ Simple Misdemeanor_____

3. Age at First Arrest:_____

4. Prior Arrests/Adjudications (indicate number of each):

	Arrests	Adjudications
Felony	_____	_____
Aggravated Misdemeanor	_____	_____
Serious Misdemeanor	_____	_____
Simple Misdemeanor	_____	_____

5. Prior Crimes Against Persons: Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. Supervision History (check one): None [ ] Re-offended after previous supervision ended [ ] Re-offended during current supervision [ ]

7. Service History (check All that apply):

[ ] None	[ ] Inpatient Evaluation	[ ] Mental Health Commitment
[ ] In-Home/ Community Based	[ ] Residential	[ ] Training School/ Locked Facility
[ ] Shelter/Foster Care	[ ] Waived to Adult Court	

8. Substance Use/Abuse (check one response in each column):

	Alcohol	Drugs
No Evidence of use/abuse	[ ]	[ ]
Experimentation	[ ]	[ ]
Frequent use/abuse	[ ]	[ ]
Unknown	[ ]	[ ]

9. Runaways (check one response in each column):

	From Home	From Placement
None	[ ]	[ ]
Few runs	[ ]	[ ]
Frequent runs (<3 days)	[ ]	[ ]
Frequent runs (>3 days)	[ ]	[ ]

10. Peer Relationships (check one): Seeks and provide good support/influence on peers [ ] Fails to avoid negative influences [ ] identifies with others who exhibit strong anti-social behavior [ ]

11. Gang Affiliation (check one): None [ ] Peripheral [ ] Full-Involvement [ ]

12. Attitude (check one): Motivated to change/accepts responsibility [ ] Uncooperative/defensive [ ] Depressed [ ] Negative/defiant/not motivated to change [ ]

13. Level of Parental Control (check one): Appropriate parental control [ ] Parental control problems [ ]

14. Current School (check one): Regular [ ] Special Education [ ] Alternative [ ] None [ ]

15. School Status (check one): Attending Regularly/Graduated/GED [ ] Not Participating/Attending [ ] Dropped Out/Expelled [ ]

16. School Discipline Problems: None [ ] Minor [ ] Moderate [ ] Severe [ ]

17. Truancy: None [ ] Occasional [ ] Frequent [ ]

18. School Suspensions: None [ ] Once [ ] 2 or 3 [ ] 4 or more time [ ]

19. Youth Currently Employed Yes [ ] No [ ]

20. Family History (check all that apply): None [ ] Physical Abuse of Youth [ ]

Sexual Abuse of Youth [ ] Neglect of Youth [ ] Parent/Sibling Alcohol Abuse [ ] Parent/Sibling Drug Abuse [ ] Parent/Sibling Criminal History [ ]

Attachment B

RISK ASSESSMENT FOLLOW-UP

District: _____ County: _____

Name/Id	Intake Date	Original Action	Re-referral?	Date	Reason

Attachment C

IOWA JUVENILE COURT INTAKE RISK ASSESSMENT

Client Name/ID_____ Sex____ Intake Date ____/____/_____

Offenses This Referral_____

STEP 1: COMPLETE ITEMS 1-4 Score

1. NUMBER OF CURRENT FELONIES (this referral)
   - None or one..... 0
   - Two..... 2
   - Three or more..... 3

2. PRIOR CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS
   - No..... 0
   - Yes..... 3

3. PEER RELATIONSHIPS
   - Seeks and provides good support and influence on peers..... 0
   - Fails to avoid negative influences..... 1
   - Identifies with others who exhibit strong anti-social behavior..... 2

4. SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS (out-of-school within the past 12 months)
   - None or one..... 0
   - Two or more..... 2

STEP 2: ADD ITEMS 1-4 AND ENTER RESULT HERE..... _____

IF SUBTOTAL ABOVE EQUALS ZERO, YOU ARE DONE.

IF SUBTOTAL ABOVE IS GREATER THAN ZERO, COMPLETE A-D:

A. AGE AT FIRST ARREST
   - 12 or older..... 0
   - 11 or younger..... 1

B. DRUG USE/ABUSE (do not count alcohol)
   - No or unknown..... 0
   - Yes..... 1

C. ADD SUBTOTAL SCORE WITH ITEM A AND B
FOR STEP 2 SCORE..... _____

D. DETERMINE RISK LEVEL (circle appropriate category below)

FOR BOYS		FOR GIRLS	
Step 2 Score	Risk Level	Step 2 Score	Risk Level
1	Medium Low	1-4	Medium Low
2-4	Medium High	5	Medium High
5-8	High	6-8	High
9+	Very High	9+	Very High

Preferred Recommendations:

Actual Recommendations:

Reasons for Differing from Disposition Guidelines:

Disposition Ordered by the Court:

PROPOSED JUVENILE COURT INTAKE RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk Categories and Recidivism Rates by Race

	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		OTHER RACE/E
RISK CATEGORY	N	Recidivism Rate	N
Low	357	14%	22
Medium Low	258	16%	32
Medium High	247	35%	47
High	130	39%	38
Very High	8	75%	6
Total	1005	23%	145

Breakdown by Other Race/Ethnic Categories and Recidivism Rate

	AFRICAN-AMERICAN		HISPANIC		NATIVE AMERICAN		ASIAN	
Risk Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
Low	16	0%	4	0%	1	0%	1	0%
Medium Low	16	25%	7	29%	4	25%	4	0%
Medium High	31	42%	9	44%	5	0%	1	--
High	27	59%	9	67%	0	--	1	100%
Very High	6	67%	0	--	0	--	0	--
Total	96	39%	29	43%	10	10%	7	14%

MCR SCORE = 0.364

Note: Race was unknown for 29 cases